

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,648	12/08/2000	Andrea Michalik	2384-002128	3034

7590

05/07/2002

Russell D. Orkin
WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

EXAMINER

BELL, KENT L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1661

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,648

Applicant(s)

MICHALIK

Examiner

KENT L. BELL

Art Unit

1661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to ~~communications~~ papers filed 2/20/02
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

K.L. Bell

Detailed Action

Status of Application

Applicant's substitute specification, including the amendments, and comments filed February 20, 2002 have been entered and fully considered but are not found persuasive as to the issues set forth in this Office action.

Objection to the Disclosure

37 CFR 1.163

The following is a quotation of section (a) of 37 CFR 1.163:

(a) The specification must contain as full and complete a disclosure as possible of the plant and the characteristics thereof that distinguish the same over related known varieties, and its antecedents, and must particularly point out where and in what manner the variety of plant has been asexually reproduced. In the case of a newly found plant, the specification must particularly point out the location and character of the area where the plant was discovered.

35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Detailed Action

As specific to United States Plant Patent applications, the specifics of 37 CFR 1.164 (reproduced below) are controlling:

The claim shall be in formal terms to the new and distinct variety of the specified plant as described and illustrated, and may also recite the principal distinguishing characteristics. More than one claim is not permitted.

In plant applications filed under 35 U.S.C 161, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 are limited. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 162:

No plant patent shall be declared invalid for noncompliance with section 112 of this title if the description is as complete as is reasonably possible. The claim in the specification shall be in formal terms to the plant shown and described.

The disclosure is objected to under 35 CFR 1.163(a) and under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification presents less than a full, clear, and complete botanical description of the plant and the characteristics which define same per se and which distinguish the plant from related known cultivars and antecedents.

More Specifically:

A. The disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR 1.121(e) because the Latin name of the genus and species of the claimed plant and Variety Denomination of the claimed plant should be preceded by a heading as set forth in 37 CFR 1.163(c)(4)(5) and 37 CFR 1.163(d). This information should be set forth before the "VARIETAL DENOMINATION" section as set forth in 37 CFR 1.163(c).

Detailed Action

B. Page 1, line 12, Applicant states “heritage”. It appears --parental cultivars-- would be more accurate to use in this instance. Correction and/or clarification is necessary.

C. Page 1, lines 26 and 27, Applicant states the instant cultivar’s Genus/species is “*Pelargonium peltatum*” then states the instant cultivar is a “Zonal geranium”. These two classifications are contradictory as *Pelargonium peltatum* is commercially known as an ivy geranium and *Pelargonium hortorum* is commercially known as a zonal geranium. Correction and/or clarification is necessary.

D. Page 3, line 12, Applicant states the instant cultivar’s petal size is “1.5 cm long; 1 cm long”. Applicant should clarify which dimension is most accurate for petal length and set forth the typical and observed petal width.

E. Page 3, line 22, Applicant states there are five sepals per inflorescence. This recitation does not appear to be accurate as many flowers make up the inflorescence. It appears applicant may have intended to state there are five sepals per flower. Correction and/or clarification is necessary.

Detailed Action

The above listing may not be complete. Applicant should carefully review the disclosure and import into same any corrected or additional information which would aid in botanically identifying and/or distinguishing the cultivar for which United States Plant Patent protection is sought.

Claim Rejection

35 U.S.C. 112, 1st & 2nd Paragraphs

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs as not being supported by a clear and complete botanical description of the plant for the reasons set forth in the Objection to the Disclosure Section above.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Detailed Action

The Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plant Breeder's Right application number 980066 (European Union) in view of applicant's admission that 'Pensyb' was sold "on March 1, 1998 in Germany" (Page 2 of response filed February 20, 2002).

The European application number 980066 was published April 15, 1998. The published European application is a "printed publication" under 35 U.S.C. 102 because it is accessible to persons concerned with the art to which the document relates. See *In re Wyer*, 655 F.2d 221, 226, 210 USPQ 790, 794 (CCPA 1981). See also MPEP § 2128. Copies of the European application (98066) are obtainable through the European Communities Register of Applications for Community Plant Variety Rights. This register is open to public inspection and the information in this register is published every two months in an Official Gazette. This Official Gazette contains information appearing in the Register such as applications for protection, proposals for variety denomination and grants of title. Other information the Community Plant Variety Office feels important to the public may also be published in the Gazette.

Thus information regarding the claimed variety, in the form of the publication noted above, was readily available to interested persons of ordinary skill in the art. A publication relied upon as prior art under 35 USC 102(b) must be enabling. The text of the relied upon publication standing alone would not enable one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention. However, when the claimed subject matter is disclosed identically by a reference, an additional reference may be relied on to show the primary reference has an "enabled disclosure". *In re Samour*, 571

Detailed Action

F.2d 559, 197 USPQ 1 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 226 USPQ 619 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also MPEP § 2131.01. When the claim is drawn to a plant, the reference, combined with knowledge in the prior art, would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to reproduce the claimed plant. *In re LeGrice*, 301 F.2d 929, 133 USPQ 365 (CCPA 1962). If one skilled in the art could reproduce the plant from a publicly available source, then a publication describing the plant would have an enabling disclosure. See *Ex parte Thomson*, 24 USPQ 2d 1618, 1620, (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992)(“The issue is not whether the [claimed] cultivar Siokra was on public use or sale in the United States but, rather, whether Siokra seeds were available to a skilled artisan anywhere in the world such that he/she could attain them and make/reproduce the Siokra cultivar disclosed in the cited publications.”). See also MPEP § 2121.03.

Applicant admits on page 2 of the response filed February 20, 2002 that the cultivar ‘Pensyb’ was sold “on March 1, 1998 in Germany”. This constitutes evidence that the claimed cultivar was available to the public more than one year before the present application’s United States filing date. The Plant Breeder’s Right application filing number 980066 is enabled because the disclosed cultivar could have been propagated from publicly available materials, and one skilled in the art would have the knowledge of how to do so, given the notoriety of various methods of asexual propagation. See, e.g., *Thomson, supra*. See also Cooper, Biotechnology and the Law § 8.05 (1998 Clark Boardman Callaghan). “In essence then, a plant patent applicant

Detailed Action

cannot lose his rights through public description of the new variety so long as he does not make the stock available for propagation by the public.”

The Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plant Breeder's Right application number OO00524 (Poland), published March 31, 1999, in view of applicant's admission that 'Pensyb' was sold "on March 1, 1998 in Germany" (Page 2 of response filed February 20, 2002), for the reasons discussed above.

The Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plant Breeder's Right application number 1086 (Czech Republic), published October 1, 1999, in view of applicant's admission that 'Pensyb' was sold "on March 1, 1998 in Germany" (Page 2 of response filed February 20, 2002), for the reasons discussed above.

The Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the SICASOV Licencing agreement for 'Pensyb', in view of applicant's admission that 'Pensyb' was sold "on March 1, 1998" (Page 2 of response filed February 20, 2002), for the reasons discussed above.

Serial Number: 09/733,648
Art Unit: 1661

Page 9

Detailed Action

Future Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kent L. Bell whose telephone number is (703) 306-3224. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached at (703) 308-4205.

The fax phone number for the group is (703) 305-3014 or 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

K. L. Bell

**KENT L. BELL
PATENT EXAMINER**

Kent L. Bell